

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the above amendments. Claims 1-30 remain pending in the case. Claims 1-30 are rejected.

35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,363,245 by Natori, hereinafter referred to as the "Natori" reference, in view of United States Patent 5,467,341 by Matsukane et al., hereinafter referred to as the "Matsukane" reference. Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-30 are not rendered obvious by the combination of Natori in view of Matsukane for the following rationale.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites that an embodiment of the present invention is directed to (emphasis added):

A method of indicating reception performance of a wireless signal at a radio frequency peripheral component card of a computer system, said method comprising:
receiving said wireless signal at a wireless receiver of said radio frequency peripheral component card;
demodulating said wireless signal;

determining an error rate of a digital data portion of said wireless signal; and
indicating a quality level of reception of said wireless signal at said radio frequency peripheral component card based on said error rate.

Independent Claims 11 and 21 recite similar limitations. Claims 2-10 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-20 that depend from independent Claim 11, and Claims 22-30 that depend from independent Claim 21 provide further recitations of the features of the present invention.

The combination of Natori and Matsukane does not teach a method of indicating reception performance of a wireless signal at a radio frequency peripheral component card of a computer system including “receiving said wireless signal at a wireless receiver of said radio frequency peripheral component card” and “indicating a quality level of reception of said wireless signal at said radio frequency peripheral component card based on said error rate,” as claimed (emphasis added). For instance, Natori and the claimed invention are very different. Applicant understands Natori to teach a portable communication terminal for judging the reception situation. In particular, Natori teaches that the portable communication terminal is a portable telephone terminal for carrying out radio communication (col. 1, lines 8-10).

Embodiments of the claimed invention are directed towards “[a] method of indicating reception performance of a wireless signal at a radio frequency

peripheral component card of a computer system” including “receiving said wireless signal at a wireless receiver of said radio frequency peripheral component card” and “indicating a quality level of reception of said wireless signal at said radio frequency peripheral component card based on said error rate,” as claimed (emphasis added). In particular, the claimed embodiments recite the limitation of a radio frequency peripheral component card. With reference to Figure 2a of the present application, communication device 200a is shown, wherein communication device 200a is a radio frequency peripheral component card, capable of being installed in an expansion slot of a personal computer (page 11, lines 22-24).

Moreover, communication device 200a includes antennae 203 and transceiver 208 (e.g., a receiver) for receiving wireless communications (page 12, lines 18-20 and page 13, lines 8-10). In other words, a wireless signal is received directly at the radio frequency peripheral component card over antennae 203 and transceiver 208. Furthermore, communication device 200a includes indicator 205 for providing an indication of the reception performance of a wireless signal (page 13, lines 12-19). In other words, the reception performance is indicated directly at the radio frequency peripheral component card using indicator 205.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Natori in particular does not teach, disclose, or suggest the method as claimed. In contrast, Natori discloses a

portable telephone terminal for displaying a reception level on a display panel of the portable telephone terminal. With reference to Figure 1 of Natori, an arrangement of a portable telephone terminal is shown (col. 3, lines 31-34). In particular, the portable telephone terminal is for providing voice communication using speaker 18 and microphone 21.

With reference to Figure 3 of Natori, portable telephone terminal 10 is shown. Portable telephone terminal 10 may be connected to information processing terminal 1 over connecting cable 2. Card 2b of connecting cable 2 is used to connect portable telephone terminal 10 to information processing terminal 1, where card 2b may be a PCMCIA card. However, the wireless signal is not received at card 2b, and the reception level is not indicated at card 2b. In contrast, the wireless signal is received at an antenna of portable telephone terminal 10 and the reception level is displayed at display panel 36 of portable telephone terminal 10.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Natori does not teach, describe or suggest “[a] method of indicating reception performance of a wireless signal at a radio frequency peripheral component card of a computer system” including “receiving said wireless signal at a wireless receiver of said radio frequency peripheral component card” and “indicating a quality level of reception of said wireless signal at said radio frequency peripheral component card based on said error rate,” as claimed (emphasis added). In contrast, Natori teaches a

portable telephone terminal that may be connected to an information processing terminal using a card, such as a PCMCIA card. Moreover, by teaching that that a wireless signal is received at the portable telephone terminal which may be connected to a card, and not the card itself, Natori teaches away from a configuration where the wireless signal is received at the card.

Moreover, the combination of Natori and Matsukane fails to teach or suggest this claim limitation because Matsukane does not overcome the shortcomings of Natori. Applicant understands Matsukane to teach an apparatus and method for alerting computer users in a wireless LAN of a service area transition. In particular, Matsukane teaches a communications adaptor that may include a wireless network interface card (col. 10, lines 22-26). However, as described above, Natori does not teach receiving a wireless signal at a card, such as a network interface card. Specifically, by teaching that that a wireless signal is received at the portable telephone terminal which may be connected to a card, and not the card itself, Natori teaches away from a configuration where the wireless signal is received at the card. Therefore, it would not be obvious to combine the teachings of Natori and Matsukane, because Natori teaches away from such a combination.

Applicant respectfully asserts that nowhere does the combination of Natori and Matsukane teach, disclose or suggest the present invention as

recited in independent Claims 1, 11 and 21, that Claims 1, 11 and 21 overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these claims are thus in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully submits the combination of Natori and Matsukane also does not teach or suggest the additional claimed features of the embodiment of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-10 that depend from independent Claim 1, Claims 12-20 that depend from independent Claim 11, and Claims 22-30 that depend from independent Claim 21. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 also overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and that these claims are thus in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims. Based on the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-30 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO L.L.P.

Dated: 2 Feb, 2005



Matthew J. Blecher
Registration No. 46,558

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060